

**Remarks**

In response to the Office action (Restriction Requirement) dated July 30, 2007, applicants hereby elect, with traverse, the claims of Examiner's Group I (claims 1–24). The Office action contends that the claims lack unity of invention under PCT rule 13.1. Applicants respectfully disagree. A group of inventions is considered linked to form a single general inventive concept where there is a technical relationship among the inventions that involves at least one common or corresponding special technical feature (MPEP 1893.03(d)). Pending claims 1–28, 30–34, 45–49 and 52–58, have at least one technical feature in common because they all depend from claim 1. It is not required that all claims have all technical features in common, simply one.

The Office action also required that applicants elect single species of plant extract, polar solvent and nonpolar solvent for initial prosecution on the merits. In response, applicants elect the plant extract *Thuja plicata* Don., the polar solvent methanol and the nonpolar solvent dichloromethane. Claims 1–17 and 19–24 read on the elected species.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if further issues remain prior to substantive examination of the present claims.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 595-5300  
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By           /Travis Young, Ph.D./            
Travis Young, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 53,819